arXiv:hep-th/9912236v2 1 Mar 2000

hep-th/9912236
CPHT-S756.1299

SO(d,d) Transformations of Ramond-Ramond Fields and Space-time Spinors

S. F. Hassan[1]

Centre de Physique Théorique, Ecole Polytechnique,
91128 Palaiseau, France

Abstract

We explicitly construct the $SO(d,d)$ transformations of Ramond-Ramond field strengths and potentials, along with those of the space-time supersymmetry parameters, the gravitinos and the dilatinos in type-II theories. The results include the case when the $SO(d,d)$ transformation involves the time direction. The derivation is based on the compatibility of $SO(d,d)$ transformations with space-time supersymmetry, which automatically guarantees compatibility with the equations of motion. It involves constructing the spinor representation of a twist that an $SO(d,d)$ action induces between the local Lorentz frames associated with the left- and right-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory. The relation to the transformation of R-R potentials as SO(d,d) spinors is also clarified.

Dec 1999

[1] e-mail: fawad@cpht.polytechnique.fr

1 Introduction

The $O(d,d)$ transformations in string theory, also referred to as the *Narain group* or the *generalized T-duality group*, have played an important role in understanding toroidal compactifications and dualities, as well as in constructing classical solutions to the low-energy equations of motion [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. The action of the $O(d,d)$ group on the NS-NS sector fields (the graviton, the antisymmetric tensor field and the dilaton), which are all assumed to be independent of d coordinates, has been known for a long time. In the worldsheet formalism, the $O(d,d)$ action on these fields can be obtained either by a canonical transformation [2, 3], or by gauging appropriate isometries in a non-linear σ-model [7]. In the framework of the low-energy effective theory, one can derive the transformation of the fields by writing the effective action for the NS-NS fields in a manifestly $O(d,d)$ invariant form [3, 4, 5, 6].

Deriving the $O(d,d)$ transformation of the Ramond-Ramond fields has turned out to be more complicated. Since the fundamental string does not carry Ramond-Ramond charges, the usual NSR formalism worldsheet methods cannot be used. In [8] the equations of motion in IIA and IIB supergravities were used to derive the transformation of the Ramond-Ramond potentials under the single T-duality subgroup of $O(d,d)$ which interchanges the two theories. However, the generalization of this approach to the full $O(d,d)$ group (or to its $SO(d,d)$ part, if we do not want to interchange IIA and IIB theories) has not been straightforward. Before describing our derivation of the transformation, which is based on supersymmetry, let us briefly review an interesting, though as yet inconclusive, alternative approach that has so far been followed.

In [9] it was observed that when type-II theories are compactified on T^6, the resulting R-R scalars fill up a Majorana-Weyl spinor representation of the associated T-duality group $SO(6,6)$. This observation was further generalized in [10] where it was pointed out that the components of R-R potentials in type-II theories compactified on T^d, when arranged in representations of the Lorentz group $SO(9-d,1)$ of the uncompactified space, fill up Majorana-Weyl spinor representations of the $SO(d,d)$ group. This observation is mainly based on the decomposition of representations of the U-duality group of the compactified theory in terms of the representations of its S-duality and T-duality subgroups. The U-duality group contains NS-NS and R-R charges in the same multiplet and, after this decomposition, the R-R charges are found to fall in the spinor representations of the T-duality group $SO(d,d)$. In [11], this problem was studied in more detail from the group theory perspective. The explicit construction of this spinor representation in terms of the supergravity fields was undertaken in [12] for a specific case of T^3 compactification of type-IIA theory, and was generalized to T^d compactifications in [13]. In this approach, one constructs $SO(d,d)$ Majorana-Weyl spinors out of combinations of R-R potentials and the NS-NS 2-form field. The guiding principle in this construction is the requirement that, in terms of these spinors, the kinetic energy terms for the R-R fields in the

low-energy effective action should have a manifestly $SO(d,d)$ invariant from. While, as such, the construction ignores the electric-magnetic duality constraints between R-R field strengths (including the self-duality of the type-IIB 5-form), nevertheless, one expects it to be consistent with these constraints and to be extendible to include the R-R dependent Chern-Simons terms in the low-energy effective action. Although this *formally* proves the $SO(d,d)$ invariance of the R-R kinetic energy terms in the low-energy effective action, so far it has not been possible to extract from this the transformation of R-R potentials and field strengths under generic non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ transformations (The reason for this difficulty will be clarified in section 6). It should be mentioned that in the case of IIA on T^3, the transformation of the R-R scalar (in 7 dimensions) as an $SO(3,3)$ spinor has also been studied in the framework non-commutative super Yang-Mills compactifications of Matrix theory [12, 14]. However, these results are not valid in string theory except in the matrix theory limit of $G_{ij} \to 0$, where many terms in the transformation drop out.

In this paper, we determine the $SO(d,d)$ transformations of the Ramond-Ramond field strengths and potentials using a more straightforward approach. In the process we also determine the $SO(d,d)$ transformations of the space-time supersymmetry parameters and R-NS fields (the gravitinos and the dilatinos). Our approach is based on the compatibility of $SO(d,d)$ transformations with space-time supersymmetry. As a result, our derivation automatically guarantees the $SO(d,d)$ covariance of the equations of motion (and hence, the invariance of the associated low-energy effective actions including the Chern-Simons terms), and is consistent with the electric-magnetic duality constraints on R-R field strengths, since in type-II theories all these are determined by supersymmetry. The method we use is a generalization of the one used in [15] for a single T-duality transformation and can be summarized as follows. In type-II supergravity theories, every spinor index originates either in the left-moving or in the right-moving worldsheet sector of the underlying string theory. On the other hand, it has been known that in flat space non-trivial $O(d,d)$ transformations correspond to transforming the left-moving and right-moving parts of the space-time coordinates by independent Lorentz rotations; $\partial_+ X \to R\,\partial_+ X$, $\partial_- X \to S\,\partial_- X$ [4, 5]. This feature also survives in curved backgrounds where, ignoring a contribution from the worldsheet fermions, one gets $\partial_\pm X \to Q_\pm\,\partial_\pm X$, though now $Q_\pm$ are space-time dependent through their dependences on the background fields [16, 17]. Thus, one can regard a non-trivial $O(d,d)$ transformation as twisting the left- and the right-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory with respect to each other. By supersymmetry, this translates to transforming the spinor indices originating in the two worldsheet sectors by two different $O(d,d)$ induced local Lorentz transformations. In particular, we may choose a convention in which the spinor index associated with, say, the right-moving sector remains unchanged, and only the one associated with the left-moving sector transforms. This determines the basic $O(d,d)$ action on the space-time spinors as well as on the Ramond-Ramond fields which can be combined into bispinors. The exact form of the transformation is fixed by the $O(d,d)$ covariance of the supersymmetry transformations. To make this structure behind the transformation of the R-R fields manifest, it is important that the supersymmetry transformations are written in terms of variables

that appear more natural in string theory. Note that in this approach we only have to construct the spinor representation of the local Lorentz twist induced by $O(d,d)$ which is an element of a subgroup of the Lorentz group $O(9,1)$, and not that of the full $O(d,d)$ group. The explicit construction we give here is for the $SO(d,d)$ part of the group. The single T-duality case has been discusses in detail in [15].

This paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we describe our notation and briefly review some aspects of the $O(d,d)$ transformations that will be needed in the rest of the paper. In particular, we emphasize that after a non-trivial O(d,d) transformation, the transformed theory contains two different vielbeins that are related by a local Lorentz transformation. This is interpreted as a twist between the local Lorentz frames associated with the left- and right-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory. In section 3 we argue that this local Lorentz twist should be absorbed by the spinors and hence construct its spinor representation. We discuss the flat-space T-duality limit in some detail to highlight some important features of the spinor representation. In section 4, we obtain the $O(d,d)$ action on the supersymmetry variation parameters, the gravitinos and the dilatinos. In section 5, we use the transformation of the space-time spinors along with the explicit construction of the spinor representation of the local Lorentz twist to obtain the $SO(d,d)$ action on the Ramond-Ramond field strengths. Then by a simple argument we show that the transformations of the R-R potentials have exactly the same form as those of the field strengths. After restricting to type-IIA on T^3, and taking the $G_{ij} \to 0$ limit, we reproduce the results obtained in the NCSYM formalism. We also write a simple $SO(d,d)$ covariant form for the R-R kinetic energy terms in the low-energy effective action. In section 6, we discuss the relation between our approach and the alternative approach in which components of R-R potentials combine into $SO(d,d)$ spinors. Our conclusions are summarized in section 7. Appendix A outlines the steps for the derivation of two sets of equations needed in section 4, and Appendix B contains some Γ-matrix results.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we will describe our notation and conventions and then briefly recall the action of the $SO(d,d)$ group on the massless NS-NS sector fields for later reference. Everything in this section applies equally well to the $O(d,d)$ group but we restrict ourselves to elements with positive determinant which do not interchange type-IIA and type-IIB theories.

Notation : We denote the 10-dimensional space-time coordinates by X^M $(M = 0, \ldots, 9)$, and assume that all fields are independent of the d coordinates X^i, for $i = 0, \cdots d-1$. For the sake of generality, we have assumed that these coordinates also include time. The remaining $10-d$ coordinates are denoted by X^μ on which the fields may depend.

$a, b = 0, \cdots, 9$ are local Lorentz frame indices. We use the symbols G, B, Q, S, R to denote 10×10 matrices and $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}$ to denote their $d \times d$ blocks labeled by i, j.

Parameterization of $SO(d,d)$: It is well known that the low-energy effective action for the massless NS-NS fields, which are restricted to be independent of X^i, is invariant under an $SO(d,d)$ group of transformations [3, 4, 5, 6]. Not all elements of this group have a non-trivial action on the background fields [4]: In fact, out of its $d(2d-1)$ elements, a d^2-dimensional subgroup corresponds to general linear coordinate transformations $GL(d)$ and another $d(d-1)/2$-dimensional subgroup corresponds to constant shifts in B_{ij}, both of which are manifest symmetries of the low-energy effective action even without restricting the fields to be independent of X^i. To describe the action of these elements on the fields, we do not really need the $O(d,d)$ formalism. Only a $d(d-1)/2$-dimensional subgroup $SO(d-1,1) \times SO(d-1,1)/SO(d-1,1)$ acts non-trivially on the background fields and therefore, in this paper, we focus on the transformations generated by this subgroup. Let $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R} \in SO(d-1,1)$. We choose a basis in which elements of $SO(d-1,1) \times SO(d-1,1) \subset SO(d,d)$ take the form

$$O = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & R \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{S} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_{10-d} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{R} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{1}_{10-d} \end{pmatrix} , \qquad O^T \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & -\hat{\eta} \end{pmatrix} O = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & -\hat{\eta} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (1)$$

Note that the transformations are embedded in 10×10 matrices and we use a *hat* to distinguish between the $SO(d-1,1)$ invariant metric $\hat{\eta}_{MN}$ appearing above, and the Minkowski metric η_{ab} of the local Lorentz frame. The case $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}$ corresponds to a coordinate rotation which is already included in $GL(d)$. The non-trivial transformations are therefore parameterized by $SO(d-1,1) \times SO(d-1,1)/SO(d-1,1)$ which is obtained by restricting O such that its only independent parameters are contained in $\mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}$ (for example, by setting $\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{1}_d$). In the following we may simply write $SO(d,d)$, understanding that we are only interested in its non-trivial elements.

Action on NS-NS backgrounds : The action of the $SO(d,d)$ group on the metric G_{MN} and the antisymmetric tensor field B_{MN} is most conveniently written in terms of a matrix M which, in our conventions for the parameterization of the group elements, is given by [3, 4, 5, 6]

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K + \mathbf{1}_{10})\, G^{-1}\, (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K^T + \mathbf{1}_{10}) & -(\hat{\eta}^{-1}K + \mathbf{1}_{10})\, G^{-1}\, (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K^T - \mathbf{1}_{10}) \\ -(\hat{\eta}^{-1}K - \mathbf{1}_{10})\, G^{-1}\, (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K^T + \mathbf{1}_{10}) & (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K - \mathbf{1}_{10})\, G^{-1}\, (\hat{\eta}^{-1}K^T - \mathbf{1}_{10}) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (2)$$

Here, $K = G + B$ and the sign of B_{MN} is chosen such that the worldsheet action has the standard form $\int d^2\sigma K_{MN} \partial_+ X^M \partial_- X^N$. The NS-NS fields G, B and ϕ then transform according to

$$\widetilde{M} = O\, M\, O^T , \qquad e^{2\widetilde{\phi}} = e^{2\phi} \sqrt{\det \widetilde{G} / \det G} . \quad (3)$$

Using (2) in (3), one can check that the transformation of the metric G can be written in two equivalent forms [18],

$$\widetilde{G}^{-1} = Q_- \, G^{-1} \, Q_-^T = Q_+ \, G^{-1} \, Q_+^T \ , \tag{4}$$

where the matrices Q^M_{-N} and Q^M_{+N} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_- &= \tfrac{1}{2} \left[(S+R) + (S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}(G+B) \right] \ , \\ Q_+ &= \tfrac{1}{2} \left[(S+R) - (S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}(G-B) \right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

These matrices will play an important role in our discussions later. Their relevance can be understood better by noting that the canonical transformation that implements the $SO(d,d)$ transformation at the worldsheet level has the form $\partial_\pm \widetilde{X}^M = Q^M_{\pm N} \partial_\pm X^N$, where we have ignored the worldsheet fermion contributions. On the worldsheet fermions, the action takes the form $\widetilde{\psi}^M_\pm = Q^M_{\pm N} \psi^N$ [17]. It is also useful to write the inverses of $Q_\pm$ in terms of the variables of the transformed theory as,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_-^{-1} &= \tfrac{1}{2} \left[(S^{-1}+R^{-1}) + (S^{-1}-R^{-1})\hat{\eta}^{-1}(\widetilde{G}+\widetilde{B}) \right] \ , \\ Q_+^{-1} &= \tfrac{1}{2} \left[(S^{-1}+R^{-1}) - (S^{-1}-R^{-1})\hat{\eta}^{-1}(\widetilde{G}-\widetilde{B}) \right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Then, from the form of S and R given in (1) it is clear that

$$(Q_\pm)^\mu_j = (Q_\pm^{-1})^\mu_j = 0 \, , \qquad (Q_\pm)^\mu_\nu = (Q_\pm^{-1})^\mu_\nu = \delta^\mu_\nu \, . \tag{7}$$

In terms of the matrix Q_- the dilaton transformation takes the from

$$e^{\phi - \widetilde{\phi}} = \sqrt{\det Q_-} \, . \tag{8}$$

<u>*Induced local Lorentz Twist :*</u> In order to obtain the transformations of spinors and R-R fields, we also need the transformation of the vielbein e^a_M. From now on, for convenience, we will use the symbol e for the inverse vielbein e^M_a and will refer to both e and e^{-1} as the vielbein. From equation (4) it is evident that *a priori* one can transform the vielbein in two different ways [17],

$$\widetilde{e}^M_{(-)a} = Q^M_{-N} \, e^N_{\ a} \, , \qquad \widetilde{e}^M_{(+)a} = Q^M_{+N} \, e^N_{\ a} \, , \tag{9}$$

both leading to the same transformed metric $\widetilde{G}^{-1} = \widetilde{e}\eta^{-1}\widetilde{e}^T$. These two vielbeins are related by a local Lorentz transformation Λ,

$$\widetilde{e}^M_{(+)b} = \widetilde{e}^M_{(-)a} \, \Lambda^a_{\ b} \ , \qquad \Lambda = e^{-1} Q_-^{-1} Q_+ e \, . \tag{10}$$

The appearance of the two vielbeins $\widetilde{e}_{(\pm)}$ can be easily understood in terms of the worldsheet theory [15]: One may regard the vielbein e^M_a as originating in either the left-moving or the right-moving sector of the worldsheet theory. It then transforms to either $\widetilde{e}_{(+)}$ or

$\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$, depending on its worldsheet origin. This is consistent with the action of $SO(d,d)$ on the worldsheet variables as described above and also with the fact that the worldsheet parity $\sigma \to -\sigma$, which interchanges the two worldsheet sectors, also interchanges the variables (S,R,B) and $(R,S,-B)$, and hence $\widetilde{e}_{(+)}$ and $\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$.

It is then clear that an $SO(d-1,1)\times SO(d-1,1)/SO(d-1,1)$ transformation twists the local Lorentz frame originating in the left-moving worldsheet sector with respect to the one originating in the right-moving sector by an amount $\Lambda^a_{\ b}$. Although all NS-NS sector fields and their supersymmetry variations are insensitive to Λ, in general this twist can be absorbed by the Ramond sector fields, leaving the two local Lorentz frames untwisted. In fact, as we will see in section 4, this is dictated by the requirement of consistency with supersymmetry which determines the way the spinor representation of the induced twist $\Lambda^a_{\ b}$ enters in the transformations of space-time spinors and Ramond-Ramond fields under non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ action. However, before that, we first construct the spinor representation of the induced twist Λ in the next section.

3 Spinor Representation of the Induced Twist

Let us consider the Γ-matrices $\Gamma^M = e^M_{\ a}\Gamma^a$ that are associated with the local Lorentz frames that originate in both the right- and the left-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory. After a non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ transformation, these transform to either $\widetilde{\Gamma}^M_{(-)} = \widetilde{e}^M_{(-)a}\Gamma^a$ or $\widetilde{\Gamma}^M_{(+)} = \widetilde{e}^M_{(+)a}\Gamma^a$, depending on the worldsheet sector in which the Dirac algebra originates. Let us choose $\widetilde{e}^M_{(-)a}$ as the vielbein in terms of which the transformed theory is to be finally written[1]and express $\widetilde{e}^M_{(+)a}$ in terms of it, using (10). Then we get

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^M_{(+)} = \Omega^{-1}\,\widetilde{\Gamma}^M_{(-)}\,\Omega\,, \tag{11}$$

where Ω is the spinor representation of the $SO(d,d)$ induced twist Λ defined by

$$\Omega^{-1}\,\Gamma^a\,\Omega = \Lambda^a_{\ b}\,\Gamma^b\,. \tag{12}$$

The factor Ω in (11) can now be absorbed in the transformation of space-time spinors. Note that this only affects spinor indices that originate in the left-moving Ramond sector of the worldsheet theory, leaving the ones associated with the right-moving Ramond sector unchanged. We will see in the next section that this is in fact dictated by supersymmetry. This situation is quite reminiscent of the construction of Ramond sector boundary states in the presence of a background worldvolume gauge field studied in [19]. Below, we

[1]Of course, this is a matter of choice and we could as well choose $\widetilde{e}^M_{(+)a}$ or any other Lorentz equivalent vielbein. However, with $\widetilde{e}^M_{(-)a}$ as the vielbein, it is natural to set $S=1$ so that in the flat-space limit, $\widetilde{e}_{(-)} \to e$ while $\widetilde{e}_{(+)} \to Re$.

explicitly construct the spinor representation Ω associated with $SO(d,d)$. For the simpler case of a single T-duality, for which $det\, O = -1$, see [15].

In general, $\Lambda^a_{\ b}$ is an element of the local Lorentz group $SO(9,1)$ associated with the left-moving sector of the worldsheet theory. Therefore, it can be parameterized by an antisymmetric matrix A_{ab} as

$$\Lambda = (\eta + A)^{-1}(\eta - A)\,, \qquad A = \eta\,(\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\,(\mathbf{1} + \Lambda)^{-1}\,. \tag{13}$$

Then, the antisymmetry of A implies that $\Lambda^T \eta \Lambda = \eta$. For the time being we assume that $\mathbf{1} + \Lambda$ is non-singular so that the above parameterization is well defined. We will later come back to the singular case. The spinor representation can now be constructed in terms of A as

$$\Omega = [\det(\eta + A)]^{-1/2}\, \text{Æ}\,(-\frac{1}{2} A_{ab}\Gamma^{ab})\,,$$

where the symbol Æ stands for an exponential-like expansion with the products of Γ-matrices fully antisymmetrized,

$$\text{Æ}(-\frac{1}{2} A_{ab}\Gamma^{ab}) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{n=5} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!\, 2^n} A_{a_1 b_1} \cdots A_{a_n b_n} \Gamma^{a_1 b_1 \cdots a_n b_n}\,.$$

A priori, Ω contains products of up to 10 Γ-matrices. However, note that equation (12) implies $\Omega^{-1}\Gamma^M \Omega = (Q_-^{-1}Q_+)^M_{\ N}\Gamma^N$. Furthermore, from (7) one can see that $(Q_-^{-1}Q_+)^\mu_{\ \nu} = \delta^\mu_\nu$. This shows that Ω keeps Γ^μ invariant and therefore should be constructed in terms of the d matrices Γ_i alone, which anti-commute with Γ^μ. To make this feature explicit, let us define $A^{MN} = e^{Ma} e^{Nb} A_{ab}$. Then, using Λ as given by (10) in the expression for A in (13), we find that the only non-zero components of A^{MN} are given by

$$\mathcal{A}^{ij} = \Big[\hat{\eta}_d (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R})^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_d + \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}) + \mathcal{B}\Big]^{-1}_{ij}\,. \tag{14}$$

Here $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\hat{\eta}_d$ denote the $d \times d$ blocks of A, S, R and $\hat{\eta}$ labeled by $i, j = 0, \cdots d-1$, and the (ij) indices on the right hand side are raised by the matrix inversion. Note that the first term in the square bracket is the inverse of the antisymmetric matrix that parameterizes the orthogonal transformation $\mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}$ through equations similar to (13). Substituting for the determinant prefactor as well, the spinor representation takes the form

$$\Omega = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)}{\det \mathcal{Q}_-}}\, \text{Æ}(-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}^{ij}\Gamma_{ij})\,, \tag{15}$$

where now,

$$\text{Æ}(-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}^{ij}\Gamma_{ij}) = 1 + \sum_{p=1}^{[d/2]} \frac{(-1)^p}{p!\, 2^p} \mathcal{A}^{i_1 i_2} \cdots \mathcal{A}^{i_{2p-1} i_{2p}} \Gamma_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{2p-1} i_{2p}}\,. \tag{16}$$

Here, $[d/2]$ stands for the integer part of $d/2$ so that, for example, the summation contains only one term for $d = 2, 3$ (involving $\Gamma_{i_1 i_2}$) and two terms for $d = 4, 5$ (involving $\Gamma_{i_1 i_2}$ and

$\Gamma_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}$). In particular, it does not contain Γ_μ as should be the case. The factor $\det \mathcal{Q}_-$ is the same quantity that appears in the transformation of $e^{2\phi}$ and $\sqrt{\det G}$. This will be important in the derivation of the transformation rules of the Ramond-Ramond fields as well as in showing the invariance of the low-energy effective action. The remaining factor has the explicit form

$$\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+) = \det[(\mathbf{1}_d + \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}) + (\mathbf{1}_d - \mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R})\hat{\eta}_d \mathcal{B}]\,, \tag{17}$$

where we have used the fact that $\det \mathcal{S} = 1$. As will be shown below, this factor is essential for getting the correct T-duality limit in cases with $\mathcal{B}_{ij} = 0$, which serves as an easy check of the results. Note that both this factor and $\mathcal{A}^{ij}$ depend only on $\mathcal{B}$ and have no dependence on G and other components of B. Furthermore, note that, as expected, Ω depends on the combination $\mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}$ alone and equals identity for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}$, corresponding to an $SO(d) \subset GL(d)$ transformation on the bosonic backgrounds which does not affect the spinor index. One can easily restrict these formulae to the case when X^i do not contain the time coordinate by replacing $\hat{\eta}_d$ by $\mathbf{1}_d$.

Singular Limits and T-duality with $B_{ij} = 0$: When $\det(\mathbf{1} + \Lambda) = 0$, the parameterization in (13) becomes singular, though in the spinor representation Ω, the singular terms cancel out and one is left with a well defined expression. This case is important as it includes T-duality transformations in flat-space (as well as in curved backgrounds as long as $\mathcal{B}_{ij} = 0$) and provides an easy non-trivial check for the correctness of our results.

To see this more clearly, let us consider, as an example, the $d = 4$ case in the flat background $G = \eta$, $B = 0$, which remains unchanged by the transformation. We assume all the four X^i to be spatial coordinates and set $S = 1$. Then, $\Lambda = R$. T-duality transformations along the four coordinates X^i correspond to taking $\mathcal{R} = -\mathbf{1}_4$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the 4×4 block of R. In this case the spinor representation is already known (see, for example, [20]) and is simply given by $\Omega = \Gamma_1\Gamma_2\Gamma_3\Gamma_4$. On the other hand, in the formalism here, this transformation clearly corresponds to a singular case since $\det(1 + \Lambda) = 0$. One can easily see that the correct spinor representation is reproduced by first going away from the T-duality point and parameterizing $\mathcal{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta & & \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta & \mathrm{O} & \\ & & \cos\phi & \sin\phi \\ \mathrm{O} & & -\sin\phi & \cos\phi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

The singular cases then correspond to either $\theta = \pi$ or $\phi = \pi$ or both. One can now easily evaluate $\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-)}$, which tends to zero in the singular limits, and $\mathcal{A}^{ij}$ (some components of which tend to ∞ in the singular limits) and get a well defined Ω as

$$\Omega = \cos\frac{\theta}{2}\cos\frac{\phi}{2} + \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\cos\frac{\phi}{2}\Gamma_{12} + \sin\frac{\phi}{2}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\Gamma_{34} + \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\sin\frac{\phi}{2}\Gamma_{1234}\,.$$

By setting $\theta = \phi = \pi$ we reproduce the correct Ω for T-dualities along all the four coordinates, while setting only one of the angles to π corresponds to T-dualities along two coordinates, combined with a non-trivial $O(2,2)$ transformation involving the other two. This discussion highlights the importance of the $\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-)}$ factor which is essential in eliminating the terms in (16) - particularly the identity - that should not appear in the flat-space T-duality limit.

Since neither $\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-)}$ nor $\mathcal{A}^{ij}$ depend on the metric, its inclusion does not change the situation described above for the flat space, except that now Ω also contains the $(\det Q_-)^{-1/2}$ factor. For example, if we consider two T-dualities along X^1 and X^2 with $\mathcal{B}_{12} = 0$, then $\Omega = (\det \mathcal{G})^{-1/2}\Gamma_{12}$, as can be directly verified using the result for a single T-duality in [15]. This case is relevant to the application of $SO(d,d)$ transformations to the simplest forms of Dp-brane solutions for which the NS-NS two form vanishes.

In the more general case when $\mathcal{B} \neq 0$, the singular limit $\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-) = 0$ includes, in particular, the interesting case $\mathcal{Q}_+ = -\mathcal{Q}_-$, or $\mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R} = -(\mathbf{1}_d + \hat{\eta}_d^{-1}\mathcal{B})(\mathbf{1}_d - \hat{\eta}_d^{-1}\mathcal{B})^{-1}$, *i.e.*, when $\mathcal{B}$ parameterizes the orthogonal matrix $\mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{S}$ through equations similar to (13). Clearly, this can arise only in even d with constant $\mathcal{B}$ and the corresponding Ω will have only one term which is proportional to $\Gamma_{i_1\cdots i_d}$. Thus we see that in this case, there exists a special $SO(d,d)$ transformation, the spinor representation of which has the same form as that for d T-dualities in flat space. In general, even in non-flat backgrounds, one can parameterize $\Lambda^a_{\ b}$ as $\mathcal{R}$ in (18) to show that a well defined spinor representation always exists in the singular limits. Having constructed the spinor representation of the induced twist, we set out to find the $SO(d,d)$ action on the massless NS-R and R-R fields that involve Ω.

4 O(d,d) Transformation of space-time Spinors

Let us consider the gravitinos $\Psi_{\pm M}$, the dilatinos $\lambda_\pm$ and the space-time supersymmetry transformation parameters $\epsilon_\pm$ in type-II string theories. The subscripts "$\pm$" denote the worldsheet sector ("+" for left-moving and "−" for right-moving) in which the spinor index of the space-time spinor, or equivalently its Ramond component, originates. We assign *positive* chirality to ϵ_- in both IIA and IIB theories which fixes the chiralities of all other spinors. All spinors are assumed to be independent of d coordinates X^i but may depend on the remaining $10-d$ coordinates X^μ. The action of the non-trivial elements of the $O(d,d)$ group on these spinors can be obtained by demanding consistency with supersymmetry transformations. These supersymmetry transformations were constructed in [21] for type-IIA theory and in [22] for type-IIB theory. Here, we write the supersymmetry transformations in the string metric and in conventions more natural to string theory as given in [15]. Denoting the supersymmetry variations corresponding to ϵ_+ and

ϵ_- by δ_+ and δ_- respectively, it turns out that $\delta_\pm\Psi_\pm$ and $\delta_\pm\lambda_\pm$ depend only on the NS-NS fields, on which the $O(d,d)$ action is well known, and are independent of R-R fields. This is expected from the fact that in string theory the supercharges act independently on the left- and right-moving worldsheet sectors, interchanging R and NS boundary conditions. Therefore, we can use these variations to determine the $O(d,d)$ action on the spinors. On the other hand, the variations $\delta_\pm\Psi_\mp$ and $\delta_\pm\lambda_\mp$ depend on the R-R fields alone and will be used to obtain their transformations in the next section. In general, these results are valid for $O(d,d)$, and we restrict ourselves to the $SO(d,d)$ subgroup only when using the explicit construction of the spinor representation given in the previous section. The derivation below closely follows the one in section 3 of [15] and generalizes it from the single T-duality case to the $O(d,d)$ group actions.

Defining the torsionful spin-connections as $W^\pm_{Mab} = w_{Mab} \mp \frac{1}{2}H_{Mab}$, the gravitino supersymmetry variations $\delta_\pm\Psi_\pm$ are given by

$$\delta_-\Psi_{-M} = \left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\,W^-_{Mab}\,\Gamma^{ab}\right)\epsilon_- \;+\cdots, \tag{19}$$

$$\delta_+\Psi_{+M} = \left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\,W^+_{Mab}\,\Gamma^{ab}\right)\epsilon_+ \;+\cdots, \tag{20}$$

where, "$\cdots$" denotes 3-spinor terms the explicit forms of which are not needed here. To obtain the $O(d,d)$ action on $\Psi_{\pm M}$, we need the transformations of $W^\pm_{Mab}$. In the $O(d,d)$ transformed theory, one can define two sets of torsionful spin-connections : $\widetilde{W}^\pm_{(-)Mab}$ corresponding to the vielbein $\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$ and $\widetilde{W}^\pm_{(+)Mab}$ corresponding to the vielbein $\widetilde{e}_{(+)}$, where the two vielbeins are given by (9). One can then show that (see appendix A)

$$\widetilde{W}^-_{(-)Mab} = W^-_{Nab}(Q_+^{-1})^N{}_M\,, \tag{21}$$

$$\widetilde{W}^+_{(+)Mab} = W^+_{Nab}(Q_-^{-1})^N{}_M\,. \tag{22}$$

Since we have chosen $\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$ as the vielbein in terms of which the transformed theory is to be written, the corresponding supersymmetry variations should be written in terms of $\widetilde{W}^\pm_{(-)Mab}$ alone. Let us first consider $\delta_-\Psi_{-M}$. Equation (7), along with the fact that ϵ_- is independent of X^i, implies that $\partial_M\epsilon_-(Q_+^{-1})^M_N = \partial_N\epsilon_-$. Then multiplying (19) by $(Q_+^{-1})^M_N$ and using (21) leads to the corresponding variation in the transformed theory provided we identify $\widetilde{\epsilon}_- = \epsilon_-$ and $\delta_-\widetilde{\Psi}_{-N} = \delta_-\Psi_{-M}(Q_+^{-1})^M_N$, up to 3-spinor terms. Similar steps applied to $\delta_+\Psi_{+M}$, on the other hand, will lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_+\Psi_{+M}(Q_-^{-1})^M_N &= \left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\,\widetilde{W}^+_{(+)Mab}\,\Gamma^{ab}\right)\epsilon_+ \;+\cdots,\\ &= \Omega^{-1}\left(\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\,\widetilde{W}^+_{(-)Mab}\,\Gamma^{ab}\right)\Omega\,\epsilon_+ \;+\cdots.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the fact that, due to (10), $\widetilde{W}_{(+)M}$ is related to $\widetilde{W}_{(-)M}$ by a local Lorentz transformation Λ, $\widetilde{W}_{(+)M} = \Lambda^{-1}\widetilde{W}_{(-)M}\Lambda + \Lambda^{-1}\partial_M\Lambda$, which has a spinor representation Ω

defined by (12). The above equation will lead to the correct form for the variation $\delta_+\widetilde{\Psi}_{+M}$ in the transformed theory provided we identify $\widetilde{\epsilon}_+ = \Omega\,\epsilon_+$ and $\delta_+\widetilde{\Psi}_{+N} = \Omega\,\delta_+\Psi_{+M}(Q_-^{-1})^M_{\ N}$, again up to 3-spinor terms. Thus under an $O(d,d)$ action, the supersymmetry transformation parameters transform to

$$\widetilde{\epsilon}_- = \epsilon_-\ , \qquad\qquad \widetilde{\epsilon}_+ = \Omega\,\epsilon_+\,, \tag{23}$$

while the transformation of the gravitinos can be read off from the $O(d,d)$ action on the supersymmetry variations $\delta_\pm\Psi_{\pm M}$ as,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Psi}_{-M} &= \Psi_{-N}\,(Q_+^{-1})^N_{\ M}\,, \\ \widetilde{\Psi}_{+M} &= \Omega\,\Psi_{+N}\,(Q_-^{-1})^N_{\ M}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Note that though the transformations we obtained for $\delta_\pm\Psi_{\pm M}$ receive corrections cubic in the spinors, our final results for $\Psi_{\pm M}$ do not receive such corrections and are, in this sense, exact. This can be understood on general grounds by noting that a 3-spinor correction to (24) will induce 4- and higher spinor couplings with derivative interactions in the supergravity Lagrangian, which should not exist. More precisely, such corrections are ruled out by the compatibility of the $O(d,d)$ transformations with the supersymmetry variations of the NS-NS fields. This was shown in [15] for the case of a single T-duality. The same argument applies to the general case here simply because, in principle, any non-trivial $O(d,d)$ transformation can be constructed by intertwining T-dualities with $GL(d)$ transformations (an explicit construction, though not needed for this argument, will be given later). Thus the $O(d,d)$ transformations have the basic property that they do not mix quantities with different space-time fermion numbers.

Though the results we have so far are enough to derive the $O(d,d)$ action on the Ramond-Ramond fields, for the sake of completeness, we also obtain the action on the dilatinos. The dilatino supersymmetry variations $\delta_\pm\lambda_\pm$ are given by

$$\delta_\pm\lambda_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\left(\Gamma^M\partial_M\phi \mp \frac{1}{12}\Gamma^{MNK}H_{MNK}\right)\epsilon_\pm\ + \cdots\,, \tag{25}$$

where again "$\cdots$" denotes 3-spinor terms. To relate these variations to the corresponding ones in the $O(d,d)$ transformed theory, we need the transformation of H_{MNK}. It is most useful to write this in the following two equivalent forms (see appendix A),

$$\widetilde{e}^M_{(\pm)a}\widetilde{e}^N_{(\pm)b}\widetilde{e}^K_{(\pm)c}\widetilde{H}_{MNK} = e^M_a e^N_b e^K_c H_{MNK} - 3\left[Q_\pm^{-1}(S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}\right]^{ij}\ W^\pm_{j[ab}e_{c]i}\,. \tag{26}$$

Using these and comparing $\delta_\pm\lambda_\pm$ with $\delta_\pm\widetilde{\lambda}_\pm$ in the transformed theory, we get the $O(d,d)$ action on the dilatinos as

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\lambda}_- &= \lambda_- - \tfrac{1}{2}\Gamma_i\left[Q_-^{-1}(S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}\right]^{ij}\Psi_{-j}\,, \\ \widetilde{\lambda}_+ &= \Omega\left(\lambda_+ + \tfrac{1}{2}\Gamma_i\left[Q_+^{-1}(S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}\right]^{ij}\Psi_{+j}\right)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Note that so far we have not restricted ourselves to supersymmetric backgrounds for which the spinors and their supersymmetry variations vanish. In such cases, the transformations above lead to the $O(d,d)$ action on the fermionic zero-modes on the background.

5 SO(d,d) Transformation of R-R Fields

Having determined the $O(d,d)$ action on $\epsilon_\pm$ and $\Psi_{\pm M}$, we are now in a position to write down its action on the Ramond-Ramond *field strengths* and *potentials*, again by demanding consistency of the transformations with supersymmetry. For the explicit construction of the transformations we restrict ourselves to $SO(d,d)$. This will automatically insure the $SO(d,d)$ covariance of the supergravity equations of motion as well as that of the electric-magnetic duality constraints on the R-R fields since all these are determined by supersymmetry. We will then compare our results with the ones obtained in the framework of NCSYM approach to Matrix theory compactifications for the $SO(3,3)$ action in type-IIA on T^3. We will end the section by writing down an $SO(d,d)$ covariant form for the Ramond-Ramond kinetic terms in the low-energy effective action.

It is most convenient to start with the supersymmetry variation $\delta_-\Psi_{+M}$ which involves the Ramond-Ramond field strengths. In both IIA and IIB theories this can be written as [21, 22] (see [15] for the required change of variables),

$$\delta_-\Psi_{+M} = \frac{1}{2(8)}\, e^{\phi}\, \mathcal{F}\, \Gamma_M\, \epsilon_- \; + \cdots . \tag{28}$$

Here, "$\cdots$" denote 3-spinor terms and $\mathcal{F}$ is a bispinor that contains the Ramond-Ramond field strengths and has the expansion,

$$\mathcal{F} = \sum_n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!}\, F^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} \Gamma^{M_1\cdots M_n} . \tag{29}$$

The fact that ϵ_- and Ψ_{+M} have the same chirality in IIB and opposite chiralities in IIA implies that in IIA theory the summation contains only terms with even n ($n = 0,2,4,6,8,10$), while in IIB theory it contains only terms with odd n ($n = 1,3,5,7,9$). Note that, for the time being, we allow $n = 0$ and $n = 10$ in type IIA theory, so that our formalism includes the massive type-IIA theory in [21]. The fact that ϵ_- has definite chirality (in our case $+1$ in both IIA and IIB) implies that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies the constraint $\mathcal{F} = -\mathcal{F}\,\Gamma_{11}$ which, in terms of the components fields, translates to $1/(10-n)!\, F^{(10-n)}\, \Gamma_{(10-n)} = 1/n!\, F^{(n)}\, \Gamma_{(n)}$. However, in the following it is more convenient to retain both $F^{(n)}$ and $F^{(10-n)}$ in the summation. Furthermore, we assume that $F_{M_1\cdots M_n}$ are independent of the coordinates X^i, which is in fact required by the X^i-independence of ϵ_- and Ψ_{+M} in (28). However, for the time being, we do not demand the Ramond-Ramond potentials $C^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n}$ to be X^i independent as this would exclude the massive IIA theory (we will briefly discuss

this issue later). Let us now consider the supersymmetry variation $\delta_- \widetilde{\Psi}_{+M}$ in the theory obtained after an $O(d,d)$ transformation,

$$\delta_- \widetilde{\Psi}_{+M} = \frac{1}{2(8)}\, e^{\widetilde{\phi}}\, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\, \widetilde{\Gamma}_{(-)M}\, \widetilde{\epsilon}_- \ + \cdots . \tag{30}$$

$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ has the same form as $\mathcal{F}$ above, with $F^{(n)}$ and Γ^N replaced by $\widetilde{F}^{(n)}$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}^N_{(-)}$, respectively. Since $\widetilde{\Gamma}^N_{(-)} = Q^N_{-M}\Gamma^M$, this becomes

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_n \frac{(-1)^n}{n!}\, \widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{N_1\cdots N_n}\, Q^{N_1}_{-M_1}\cdots Q^{N_n}_{-M_n}\, \Gamma^{M_1\cdots M_n} . \tag{31}$$

Now, using (23) and (24) along with (8) in (30) and comparing the result with (28), we get a compact expression for the $O(d,d)$ action on the Ramond-Ramond bispinor field as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = \sqrt{\det\, Q_-}\, \Omega\, \mathcal{F} . \tag{32}$$

In other words, $e^{\phi}\mathcal{F}$, as well as $(\det G)^{1/4}\mathcal{F}$ transform as spinors under the induced Lorentz twist. This expression is valid for $O(d,d)$ and could interchange IIA and IIB theories for elements with determinant -1. However, to obtain the transformation of the components of $\mathcal{F}$, we restrict ourselves to the $SO(d,d)$ case and use the explicit expression for Ω as given by (15). The above equation then reduces to

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}}\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)}\ \text{Æ}\,(-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}^{ij}\Gamma_{ij})\,\mathcal{F} . \tag{33}$$

The expression for the component fields are obtained by fusing together the antisymmetrized products of Γ-matrices in the expansions of Æ (16) and $\mathcal{F}$ (29), using a useful Γ-matrix identity in [24, 25] (that we quote in appendix B), and then matching the result with the expansion of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ in (31). We will first consider a simple case and then write down the general result.

The $d = 2, 3$ Cases : Before writing down the general result, it is instructive to look at the simplest case of $[d/2] = 1$ (corresponding to $SO(2,2)$ and $SO(3,3)$ transformations). In this case, one can easily work out the transformation of Ramond-Ramond field strengths, using the Γ-matrix identity (B.2) in appendix B, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} \ &= \ 2^{-\frac{d}{2}}\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)}\,\Bigg[\, F^{(n)}_{N_1\cdots N_n} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}^{i_1 i_2}\Bigg(n(n-1)G_{i_1N_1}G_{i_2N_2}\, F^{(n-2)}_{N_3\cdots N_n} \\ &\qquad + 2nG_{i_1N_1}\, F^{(n)}_{i_2N_2\cdots N_n} + F^{(n+2)}_{i_2 i_1 N_1\cdots N_n}\Bigg)\Bigg](Q^{-1}_-)^{N_1}_{[M_1}\cdots(Q^{-1}_-)^{N_n}_{M_n]} .\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

This expression is valid in both IIA and IIB theories, depending on whether n is *even* or *odd*, and includes the massive IIA theory if the field strengths $F^{(0)}$ or $F^{(10)}$ are non-vanishing. Also, by construction, it does not mix *odd*-form and *even*-form field strengths.

However, it does transform the field strengths non-trivially. In particular, if the original theory has only a non-vanishing q-form field strength $F^{(q)}$, corresponding to $D(q-2)$-branes, the theory obtained after the transformation will generically have non-zero q, $(q-2)$ and $(q+2)$-from field strengths, depending on whether the transformation involves directions parallel or transverse to the brane, or a mixture of the two. On the other hand, by construction, the new configuration preserves the same amount of supersymmetry as the original solution. Thus the new configuration can only be a real (non-marginal) bound state of Dq, $D(q-2)$ and $D(q-4)$-branes. A more detailed discussion of this issue can be found in [23].

As a simple explicit example, let us consider the case of non-trivial $SO(2,2)$ transformations in flat-space. Setting $S=1$, this corresponds to

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{A}^{ij} = \frac{\sin\frac{\theta}{2}}{\cos\frac{\theta}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $Q_- = 1$ and $\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)} = 2\cos(\theta/2)$. Taking care of the antisymmetrization factors, one obtains

$$\widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{12\mu_3\cdots\mu_n} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n)}_{12\mu_3\cdots\mu_n} + \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n-2)}_{\mu_3\cdots\mu_n}, \qquad \widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{1\mu_2\cdots\mu_n} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n)}_{1\mu_2\cdots\mu_n} + \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n)}_{2\mu_2\cdots\mu_n},$$
$$\widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{2\mu_2\cdots\mu_n} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n)}_{2\mu_2\cdots\mu_n} - \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n)}_{1\mu_2\cdots\mu_n}, \qquad \widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_n} = \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2} F^{(n)}_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_n} - \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\, F^{(n+2)}_{12\mu_1\cdots\mu_n}.$$

In particular, for $\theta=\pi$ one reproduces the correct result for two T-dualities along X^1 and X^2, as can be verified directly by using the T-duality transformation of $F^{(n)}$ as given, for example, in [15]. Furthermore, the first equation above implies that if $F^{(0)}$ is non-zero, then one gets a non-zero $\widetilde{F}^{(2)}_{12}$. Therefore, in the case of massive IIA theory, one cannot restrict the potential $C^{(1)}$ to be X^i independent. This is discussed in more detail in [26] for a single T-duality and in [27] for two T-dualities.

The General $SO(d,d)$ Case: Following the same steps as described above, one can work out the transformation of Ramond-Ramond field strengths under the action of non-trivial elements of the $SO(d,d)$ group, for generic d. Using (B.2) in (33), and after some straightforward manipulations, one obtains

$$\widetilde{F}^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}}\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)} \sum_{p=0}^{[d/2]} \left[\frac{(-1)^p}{p!2^p}\, \mathcal{A}^{[i_1 i_2}\cdots\mathcal{A}^{i_{2p-1}i_{2p}]} \right.$$
$$\left. \times \left(\sum_{r=0}^{2p} \frac{(2p)!}{(2p-r)!}\, {}^nC_r\, G_{i_1 N_1}\cdots G_{i_r N_r} F^{(n+2p-2r)}_{i_{2p}\cdots i_{r+1} N_{r+1}\cdots N_n} \right) \right] (Q_-^{-1})^{N_1}_{[M_1}\cdots(Q_-^{-1})^{N_n}_{M_n]}, \quad (35)$$

where, ${}^nC_r$ are the binomial expansion coefficients and $\mathcal{A}^{ij}$ and $\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)$ are given by (14) and (17), respectively. To evaluate Q_-^{-1}, one can use either (5) or (6), according to convenience. Besides the non-trivial elements that we have considered so far, the full

$SO(d,d)$ group also includes $GL(d)$ transformations involving X^i and constant shifts in B_{ij}. $F^{(n)}$ simply transform as n-forms under the first set and are invariant under the second set. This completes the construction of the full $SO(d,d)$ action on the Ramond-Ramond field strengths.

Thought the transformation formula for $F^{(n)}$ looks rather bulky, in practice, at least some components of it are simplified when restricted to specific solutions. This is especially the case when the potentials $C^{(n)}$ can be chosen to be X^i independent, so that $F_{i_1\cdots i_n} = 0$.

Transformation of Ramond-Ramond Potentials : So far, we have only demanded the X^i-independence of the R-R field strengths and not that of the potentials since this would exclude the massive type-IIA theory. This is pointed out above for the $SO(2,2)$ case in flat space and was considered in more detail in [26, 27]. Let us now restrict ourselves to the standard type-IIA and IIB theories by setting the IIA mass parameter $F^{(0)}$ to zero. The X^i-independence of the Ramond-Ramond potentials is now compatible with $SO(d,d)$ transformations.

It is convenient to define the potentials $C^{(n)}$ such that

$$F^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} = n\partial_{[M_1} C^{(n-1)}_{M_2\cdots M_n]} - \frac{n!}{3!(n-3)!} H_{[M_1M_2M_3} C^{(n-3)}_{M_4\cdots M_n]}\,. \tag{36}$$

In this convention, the potentials are invariant under the NS-NS 2-form gauge transformations, but $C^{(4)}$ is not invariant under the $SL(2,R)$ group of type-IIB theory. To obtain the $SO(d,d)$ action on the Ramond-Ramond potentials, the straightforward (although tedious) procedure would be to substitute (36) in (35), and use the transformation of H as given by (26), to work out the transformation of $C^{(n)}$ iteratively in n. The calculation may get somewhat simplified if one chooses to work in the local Lorentz frame, since then one will not have to bother about the factors of Q_-^{-1} in (35). However, here we will obtain this transformation by a very simple argument:

First, note that any non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ transformation can, in principle, be constructed as a combination of appropriately chosen discrete T-duality transformations and simple coordinate rotations obtained by setting $S = R = A$. Since this statement is crucial for our argument here and the one in the next section, we will spell it out in some detail: Any $O(d)$ rotation, say R, can be decomposed as a product of reflections about planes perpendicular to properly chosen axes, or equivalently, as a product of reflections T_i about planes perpendicular to the coordinate axes x^i, and properly chosen rotations A_k; $R = T_{i_n} A_{k_n} \cdots T_{i_1} A_{k_1}$. If we choose $S = A_{k_n} \cdots A_{k_1}$, then the $O(d,d)$ transformation implemented by R and S corresponds to a sequence of T-duality transformations T_i intertwined with coordinate rotations A_k, which proves the statement above. Therefore, knowing how $F^{(n)}$ transforms under a single T-duality, one can in principle construct its transformation under any non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ element by using this decomposition, and reproduce equation (35). However, as emphasized in [15], $F^{(n)}$ and $C^{(n)}$ transform in

exactly the same way under a single T-duality (this is true up to a sign which is immaterial since we need even number of T-dualities). Being n-forms, they also transform in the same way under coordinate transformations. This implies that if we construct the action of an $SO(d,d)$ element on $C^{(n)}$, using its decomposition in terms of T-dualities and rotations, then we will end up with the same expression as for $F^{(n)}$. Hence,

$$\widetilde{C}^{(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}}\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{Q}_+)}\sum_{p=0}^{[d/2]}\left[\frac{(-1)^p}{p!2^p}\,\mathcal{A}^{[i_1 i_2}\cdots\mathcal{A}^{i_{2p-1}i_{2p}]}\right.$$
$$\left.\times\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2p}\frac{(2p)!}{(2p-r)!}\,{}^nC_r\,G_{i_1N_1}\cdots G_{i_rN_r}C^{(n+2p-2r)}_{i_{2p}\cdots i_{r+1}N_{r+1}\cdots N_n}\right)\right](Q_-^{-1})^{N_1}_{[M_1}\cdots(Q_-^{-1})^{N_n}_{M_n]}\,. \quad (37)$$

As for the field strengths, $C^{(n)}$ are invariant under constant shifts of B_{ij} and transform as n-forms under $GL(d)$. This completes the construction of the $SO(d,d)$ action on Ramond-Ramond potentials. Defining a bispinor $\mathcal{C}$ in the same way as $\mathcal{F}$ in (29), the above transformation takes the compact form

$$[\det\widetilde{G}]^{\frac{1}{4}}\,\widetilde{\mathcal{C}} = \Omega\,[\det G]^{\frac{1}{4}}\,\mathcal{C} \quad (38)$$

We will not discuss the $SO(d,d)$ action on the R-R potentials in the massive IIA theory, in which case some of the $C^{(n)}$ will necessarily have an X^i dependence and the above transformations will get modified. However, we comment that, as shown in [15] for the single T-duality case, it should be possible to define new X^i independent variables $\widehat{C}^{(n)}$ in terms of $C^{(n)}$ and the mass parameter, such that the $SO(d,d)$ action on the potentials has exactly the same form as in (37), but now with the $C^{(n)}$ replaced by the new variables $\widehat{C}^{(n)}$.

Comparison with Results from NCSYM: In some cases, the transformation of the R-R potentials has also been studied in the framework of M-theory compactifications to super Yang-Mills theories on non-commutative tori [12, 14], where the string theory $SO(d,d)$ transformations are implemented as a Morita equivalence. From the 10-dimensional string theory point of view, the transformation obtained in this approach is valid only in the $G_{ij}\to 0$ limit and therefore, is not expected to coincide with the ones given above. To make a comparison with these results, we restrict ourselves to the case considered in [12], which studies the 1-form and 3-form potentials in type IIA theory compactified on a 3-torus. The R-R potentials are assumed to have non-zero components only along the torus directions. In our approach, the $SO(3,3)$ transformation of these potentials can be read off from (37) (or more directly from (34) after replacing $F^{(n)}$ by $C^{(n)}$) as,

$$\frac{2^{3/2}\,\widetilde{C}_i}{\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-)}} = \left[C_l \;-\; \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}^{pq}\Big(2G_{pl}\,C_q - C_{pql}\Big)\right](Q_-^{-1})^l_{\ i}\,,$$
$$\frac{2^{3/2}\,\widetilde{C}_{ijk}}{\sqrt{\det(\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{Q}_-)}} = \left[C_{lmn} \;-\; \mathcal{A}^{pq}\Big(3\,G_{pl}\,G_{qm}\,C_n + 3\,G_{pl}\,C_{qmn}\Big)\right](Q_-^{-1})^l_{\ i}(Q_-^{-1})^m_{\ j}(Q_-^{-1})^n_{\ k}\,.$$

The corresponding equations obtained in the NCSYM framework do not coincide with these. However, in the limit $G_{ij} \to 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_+ = \mathcal{Q}_- \equiv \mathcal{Q}\,, \qquad \mathcal{A}^{pq} = \frac{1}{2}[\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}-\mathcal{R})]^{pq}\,, \qquad (as \qquad G_{ij} \to 0)$$

and the above transformations go over to,

$$\widetilde{C}_i \to \sqrt{\det(Q)}\left[C_l\,(Q^{-1})^l{}_i + \tfrac{1}{4}\,C_{lmn}\,(Q^{-1})^l{}_i (Q^{-1})^m{}_j (Q^{-1})^n{}_k \left[(\mathcal{S}-\mathcal{R})\,Q^T\right]^{jk}\right],$$
$$\widetilde{C}_{ijk} \to \sqrt{\det(Q)}\;C_{lmn}\,(Q^{-1})^l{}_i (Q^{-1})^m{}_j (Q^{-1})^n{}_k\,.$$

These coincide with the transformations obtained in the NCSYM approach [12, 14] (also see [28]). We can easily generalize the results obtained so far in the NCSYM approach by taking the $G_{ij} \to 0$ limit in (37).

$SO(d,d)$ Covariant form of the R-R Kinetic Energy Terms : Our analysis so far has been based on showing the $SO(d,d)$ covariance of the supersymmetry transformations in type-II theories. Since the equations of motion in these theories are determined by supersymmetry, this approach also guarantees their $SO(d,d)$ covariance, and hence that of the corresponding low-energy effective actions. The $SO(d,d)$ covariant form of the effective action for the NS-NS fields has been known for a long time [3, 4, 5, 6]. Here, we write down an $SO(d,d)$ covariant form for the kinetic energy terms of the Ramond-Ramond fields in the type-II low-energy effective actions (ignoring the subtlety associated with the self-dual 5-form in type-IIB theory).

In terms of the Ramond-Ramond bispinor $\mathcal{F}$ given by (29), The R-R kinetic energy terms in both IIA and IIB theory can be written as

$$\frac{1}{8}\sqrt{\det(G)}\;\sum_n \frac{1}{n!}\,F_{a_1\cdots a_n}\,F^{a_1\cdots a_n} = -\frac{2^{-5}}{8}\sqrt{\det(G)}\;\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma^0\,\mathcal{F}^T\,\Gamma^0\,\Gamma_{11}\,\mathcal{F}\,\Gamma_{11}\right), \qquad (39)$$

which can be checked using the trace formula (B.3) for the Γ-matrices given in appendix B. The index on Γ^0 is a local Lorentz frame index. The right hand side is simply a generalization of the expression $\bar{\psi}\Gamma_{11}\psi$ for spinor ψ to the bispinor $\mathcal{F}$. In type-IIA theory $\Gamma_{11}\,\mathcal{F}\,\Gamma_{11} = \mathcal{F}$ while in IIB $\Gamma_{11}\,\mathcal{F}\,\Gamma_{11} = -\mathcal{F}$, which restricts the summation on the right hand side of the equation to even n or odd n, respectively. The equation includes $F^{(n)}$ and $F^{(10-n)}$ separately and the duality between the two, including the self-duality of the 5-form, should be imposed by hand. The Γ_{11} factors in the expression on the right hand side have been inserted so that the kinetic energy terms for *odd*-forms and *even*-forms have the same sign, as should be the case in our metric convention which is $\{-,+,\cdots,+\}$. Now, using (31) and (4), one can easily check that the R-R kinetic energy terms, as given by the left hand side of (39), are manifestly $SO(d,d)$ covariant since,

$$\Omega^{-1} = -\Gamma^0\,\Omega^T\,\Gamma^0\,, \qquad \Omega\,\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{11}\,\Omega\,.$$

The Ramond-Ramond fields also enter the action through Chern-Simons terms that we do not consider here, though it should be possible to write these too in a manifestly $SO(d,d)$ covariant form using the bispinor $\mathcal{F}$ and a similar quantity constructed in terms of the R-R potentials.

The $SO(d,d)$ covariant form of the R-R kinetic terms given above is, as such, not restrictive enough to determine the $SO(d,d)$ transformation of the R-R field strengths if we did not already know the transformation. However, the addition of the Chern-Simons terms may change the situation. Another option is to use the kinetic terms alone, but express the field strengths in terms of the potentials and the NS-NS 3-form field strength H. This form, along with the transformation of H given in (26) is restrictive enough to determine transformation of the R-R potentials. In particular, note that the antisymmetric part of the factor $Q_{\pm}^{-1}(S-R)\hat{\eta}^{-1}$ appearing in (26) is related to $\mathcal{A}^{ij}$ appearing in the transformation of $C^{(n)}$ in (37).

The above $SO(d,d)$ invariant form of the action is not invariant under $O(d,d)$ transformations with $\det O = -1$ (including single T-dualities) that interchange IIA and IIB theories. This is because in such cases, $\Omega\,\Gamma_{11} = -\Gamma_{11}\,\Omega$ and after the transformation one obtains the kinetic energy terms with the wrong sign.

6 R-R Potentials as SO(d,d) Spinors

We have seen that $O(d,d)$ transformations introduce a twist Λ between the Lorentz frames associated with the left- and the right-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory. This twist could be regarded as an element of the space-time Lorentz group $O(9,1)$, though its action differs from that of the Lorentz group in that it affects only part of the fields. It was shown that the spinor representation Ω of this twist determines the $O(d,d)$ transformations of R-R field strengths and potentials in a natural way. Though the approach we have followed appears very natural from the perturbative string theory point of view, there also exists, as described in the introduction, an alternative approach to the problem in which the R-R fields are arranged as components of an $SO(d,d)$ spinor [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. While this construction may appear *ad hoc* from the point of view of perturbative string theory, it fits naturally in the U-duality group structure of non-perturbative string theory. However, so far, it has not been possible to obtain the R-R field transformations (35) and (37) in this approach which, as we shall see, may not be an easy task. In the following, we will discuss the relationship between these two approaches.

Let $\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ denote the sums of n-forms $\sum_{n=1}^{n=9} F^{(n)}$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{n=8} C^{(n)}$, respectively. Equation (36) can then be written as $\mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{H}\wedge\mathbf{C}$ and the potentials $C^{(n)}$ defined by it are invariant under the B_{MN} gauge transformations. It is also common to use an alternative

set of potentials $C'^{(n)}$ defined by

$$\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{C} \wedge e^{-\mathbf{B}}, \qquad \mathbf{F} = e^{\mathbf{B}} \wedge d\mathbf{C}'. \tag{40}$$

These are not invariant under the B_{MN} gauge transformations. Comparing with the construction in [12, 13], it is clear that $\mathbf{C}'$ is the field in terms of which the $SO(d,d)$ spinor is constructed. We will briefly review this construction here: Let γ^I, for $I = 1, \cdots, 2d$, denote Gamma matrices of the Dirac algebra associated with $SO(d,d)$ in a basis in which the invariant metric is of the from $diag(\hat{\eta}_d, -\hat{\eta}_d)$. Defining $a^{i\pm} = (\gamma^i \pm \gamma^{d+i})/2$, for $i = 1, \cdots, d$, one can easily verify that a^{i+} and $a^-_j = \hat{\eta}_{jk} a^{k-}$ satisfy the Heisenberg algebra $\{a^{i+}, a^-_j\} = \delta^i_j$. A basis for the spinor representation (Majorana in this case) is then obtained by applying the *raising* operators a^{i+} on the *vacuum* state $|0\rangle$, defined by $a^-_i|0\rangle = 0$, for all i. Restricting to states with either even or odd numbers of a^+'s, one obtains the two Majorana-Weyl basis states. Now consider the components $C'^{(n)}_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q i_1\cdots i_{n-q}}$ of R-R potentials, for all n and fixed q. The $SO(d,d)$ Majorana-Weyl spinors constructed out of the R-R potentials are then given by

$$|\mathbf{C}'\rangle_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q} = \sum_{p=0}^{d} C'^{(q+p)}_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q i_1\cdots i_p} a^{i_1+}\cdots a^{i_p+}|0\rangle \tag{41}$$

Note that since $n = q + p$ is either even (IIB) or odd (IIA), in the summation on the right hand side p runs over either even or odd values at a time, ensuring that the spinor is Majorana-Weyl. The $SO(d,d)$ action on $C'^{(n)}$ can be obtained by constructing the spinor representation of the group following the procedure described in section 3. However, to elucidate the relationship to the approach followed in this paper, we obtain the transformation of $C'^{(n)}$ under non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ elements in a much simpler way, using our results in section 5.

The straightforward procedure of obtaining the transformations of $C'^{(n)}$ from that of $C^{(n)}$, using (40), runs into trouble since the field B_{MN} transforms in a rather complicated way [4]. However, we can circumvent this and obtain these transformations by a simple argument: Under single T-duality transformations both $C^{(n)}$ and B_{MN} transform in a much simpler way. Using these transformations (for example, as given in [15]) in (40) one can easily work out the transformation of $C'^{(n)}$ under a single T-duality, say along X^9, to obtain

$$\widetilde{C}'^{(n)}_{9 i_2\cdots i_n} = C'^{(n-1)}_{i_2\cdots i_n}, \qquad \widetilde{C}'^{(n)}_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_n} = C'^{(n+1)}_{9 i_1\cdots i_n}. \tag{42}$$

Note that this is exactly how $C^{(n)}$ would transform in flat space. Now, using the construction described above equation (37), we can intertwine single T-dualities with coordinate rotations to obtain non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ transformations of $C'^{(n)}$. On the other hand, since $C'^{(n)}$ and $C^{(n)}$ transform in the same way under coordinate rotations, this $SO(d,d)$ transformation of $C'^{(n)}$ can also be obtained from that of $C^{(n)}$ (37) in the flat-space limit of $G_{MN} \to \hat{\eta}_{MN}$ and $B_{MN} = 0$ [2]. After some rearrangements, and setting $\mathcal{S} = \mathbf{1}_d$ by a

[2]The *hat* on η reminds us that the transformation for $C'^{(n)}$ obtained this way is still in curved space and that space-time indices are raised and lowered with G_{MN}.

coordinate rotation, we obtain,

$$\widetilde{C}^{\,\prime(n)}_{M_1\cdots M_n} = 2^{-\frac{d}{2}}\sqrt{\det(\mathbf{1}_d+\mathcal{R})}\sum_{p=0}^{[d/2]}\Bigg[\frac{(-1)^p}{p!2^p}\,\Theta_{[i_1i_2}\cdots\Theta_{i_{2p-1}i_{2p}]} \times\left(\sum_{r=0}^{2p}\frac{(2p)!}{(2p-r)!}\,{}^nC_r\,\hat{\eta}^{i_{2p}j_{2p}}\cdots\hat{\eta}^{i_{r+1}j_{r+1}}\,C^{\,\prime(n+2p-2r)}_{j_{2p}\cdots j_{r+1}[M_{r+1}\cdots M_n}\,\delta^{i_1}_{\ M_1}\cdots\delta^{i_r}_{\ M_r]}\right)\Bigg], \tag{43}$$

with

$$\Theta_{ij} = \Big[\hat{\eta}_d\,(\mathbf{1}_d+\mathcal{R})^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_d-\mathcal{R})\Big]_{ij}\,. \tag{44}$$

Clearly, Θ is the antisymmetric matrix that parameterizes non-trivial $SO(d,d)$ elements in (1) (with $\mathcal{S}=\mathbf{1}_d$) and in terms of which the spinor representation of the group can be constructed as described in section 3. The dependence on $\mathcal{S}$ can be easily restored by performing a coordinate rotation by an amount $\mathcal{S}^{-1}$ and at the same time replacing $\mathcal{R}$ with $\mathcal{S}^{-1}\mathcal{R}$, as should be the case.

We have obtained equation (43) without having to assume that the R-R potentials $C^{\,\prime(n)}$ transform as $SO(d,d)$ spinors. However, the final result can also be written in terms of the spinors (41) as

$$|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}\,'\rangle_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q} = \Omega_{NT}|\mathbf{C}\,'\rangle_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q}\,, \tag{45}$$

where Ω_{NT} stands for the spinor representation of the non-trivial elements of the $SO(d,d)$ parameterized by $SO(d-1,1)\times SO(d-1,1)/SO(d-1,1)$. Thus, the explicit transformation of $C^{(n)}$ (37) leads us, by a very simple argument, to the transformation of $C^{\,\prime(n)}$ as $SO(d,d)$ spinors (at least for the non-trivial part of the group). The converse, however, is not true. To construct the transformation of $C^{(n)}$ from that of $C^{\,\prime(n)}$, we have to use (40) but the $SO(d,d)$ transformation of B_{MN} [4] is expected to make things complicated.

As we have seen in the previous section, $C^{(n)}$ and $F^{(n)}$ transform in exactly the same way under $SO(d,d)$ transformations. This implies that we can also construct $SO(d,d)$ spinors out of $F^{(n)}$. In fact, in analogy with $\mathbf{C}\,'$ in (40), we can define

$$\mathbf{F}\,' \;=\; \mathbf{F}\wedge e^{-\mathbf{B}} \;=\; d\mathbf{C}\,'\,. \tag{46}$$

Then $|\mathbf{F}\,'\rangle_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_q}$ constructed in analogy with (41) also transform as $SO(d,d)$ spinors.

7 Conclusions

We have obtained the $SO(d,d)$ transformations of the Ramond-Ramond field strengths and potentials and, in the process, have also determined the transformations of the space-time supersymmetry parameters, the gravitinos and the dilatinos in type-II theories. The

derivation is based on supersymmetry and is therefore guaranteed to be consistent with the equations of motion provided the fields are independent of the d coordinates with respect to which the transformation is performed. The transformations we obtain for the R-R field strengths also include the massive IIA theory, though for the R-R potentials we restrict ourselves to the usual "massless" IIA case. Besides the general cases, we also discuss some special cases to highlight some features of the transformation and to check the correctness of our results in these cases. Since the transformations could also include the time direction, we have been careful to keep track of the indices by explicitly retaining the flat metric $\hat{\eta}$. Though we restrict ourselves to the $SO(d,d)$ case, all formulas which do not involve the explicit form of the spinor representation Ω, constructed in section 3, are also valid for the $O(d,d)$ case. In the $SO(3,3)$ case we reproduce the results obtained in the NCSYM formalism of Matrix theory compactifications by taking the limit $G_{ij} \to 0$. It is also shown that the R-R kinetic energy terms in the low-energy effective action can be easily written in an $SO(d,d)$ invariant form in terms of the R-R bispinor. We also clarify the relation between our approach and an alternative one which is based on constructing Majorana-Weyl spinor representations of the $SO(d,d)$ group in terms of the Ramond-Ramond potentials.

The picture emerging is that $O(d,d)$ transformations induce a rotation between the local Lorentz frames originating in the left- and the right-moving sectors of the worldsheet theory. The misalignment of the frames can be absorbed by the spinor index associated with one of the frames. This is the basic mechanism by which the $O(d,d)$ action is transfered to the Ramond sector of the Theory.

The transformations obtained in this paper can be used to construct non-trivial D-brane configurations, starting from simpler ones. An important feature of the transformation is that, applied to brane configurations for which the surviving supersymmetries are independent of X^i, it can produce more complicated brane configurations without reducing the amount of supersymmetry preserved. This is an indication that the final configuration corresponds to a non-trivial bound state of branes, since otherwise it would invariably break some of the supersymmetries. Though we have not considered such applications here, as an example, we mention [29]. Here, the authors construct a class of $SO(4,4)$ transformations by explicitly intertwining T-dualities and spatial rotations to obtain a (D1,D5)-brane system with a non-vanishing B-field. This solution corresponds to a genuine bound state of D1 and D5-branes as opposed to the marginal bound state with zero B-field. Some other examples were studied earlier in [23]

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis and A. Armoni for useful discussions and comments.

Appendix

A Some derivations

In this appendix we briefly describe the steps one could follow to derive equations (21), (22) and (26). To derive (21), one starts from the covariant constancy of $\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$,

$$\widetilde{W}^{-\,b}_{(-)\,Na} = \widetilde{\Omega}^{-\,M}_{NK}\widetilde{e}^{K}_{(-)\,a}\widetilde{e}^{b}_{(-)\,M} + \widetilde{e}^{b}_{(-)\,M}\partial_N\widetilde{e}^{M}_{(-)\,a}\,,$$

where $\Omega^{\mp\,M}_{NK} = \Gamma^{M}_{NK} \mp G^{MP}H_{PNK}$ are the torsionful connections. Using the $O(d,d)$ transformation of $\Omega^{-\,M}_{NK}$ as given in [17] and rewriting the result in terms of $W^{-\,b}_{N\,a}$, one will finally recover (21) after some manipulations. One will also have to use (7) as well as $Q_+ = Q_- - (S-R)G$ to simplify $Q_-^{-1}Q_+$. To obtain (22) one follows the same procedure, but now starting with the covariant constancy condition for $\widetilde{e}_{(+)}$.

To obtain (26) with the lower signs, we start from the definition of $\widetilde{W}^{-}_{(-)Mab}$ which can be written as

$$\widetilde{e}^{M}_{(-)\,a}\widetilde{e}^{N}_{(-)\,b}\widetilde{e}^{K}_{(-)\,c}\widetilde{H}_{MNK} = 2\eta_{ad}(\widetilde{w}^{d}_{(-)\,Mc} - \widetilde{W}^{-d}_{(-)\,Mc})\widetilde{e}^{M}_{(-)\,b}\,.$$

First, we write $\widetilde{W}^{-}_{(-)}$ in terms of W^{-} and express the result in terms of H. Then, we expand $\widetilde{w}^{d}_{(-)\,Mc}$ in terms of the vielbein $\widetilde{e}_{(-)}$ and express the result in terms of w^{d}_{Mc} and W^{-a}_{ib}. After some further manipulations one gets (26) with the lower signs. To get the equation with upper signs, replace $e_{(-)}$ by $e_{(+)}$ in the starting equation.

B Some Γ-matrix Results

We use the metric signature $\{-1,+1,\ldots,+1\}$ and define the Γ-matrices such that,

$$\{\Gamma^a,\Gamma^b\} = 2\eta^{ab}\,, \tag{B.1}$$

In the Majorana-Weyl representation all Γ^a are real, with Γ^0 antisymmetric and others symmetric. To fuse products of Γ-matrices into antisymmetrized ones, we use the identity

$$\Gamma_{a_1\cdots a_i}\,\Gamma^{b_1\cdots b_j} = \sum_{k=|i-j|}^{i+j}\frac{i!\,j!}{s!\,t!\,u!}\,\delta^{[b_1}_{[a_i}\cdots\delta^{b_s}_{a_{t+1}}\,\Gamma_{a_1\cdots a_t]}{}^{b_{s+1}\cdots b_j]}\,, \tag{B.2}$$

with

$$s = \frac{1}{2}(i+j-k)\,,\quad t = \frac{1}{2}(i-j+k)\,,\quad u = \frac{1}{2}(-i+j+k)\,.$$

In the summation, only those values of k appear for which s, t and u are integers, *i.e.*, $k = |i-j|, |i-j|+2, \cdots, i+j-2, i+j$. The trace of products of Γ-matrices is given by

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Gamma^{a_1\cdots a_l}\Gamma_{b_1\cdots b_k}) = 2^5\,\delta_{kl}\,(-1)^{k(k-1)/2}\,k!\,\delta^{[a_1}_{[b_1}\cdots\delta^{a_k]}_{b_k]}\,. \tag{B.3}$$

All antisymmetrizations are with unit weight.

References

[1] K. S. Narain, Phys. Lett. **B169** (1986) 41;
K. S. Narain, M. H. Sarmadi and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B279** (1987) 369.

[2] A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys **B322** (1989) 167.

[3] K. A. Meissner and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B267** (1991) 33.

[4] A. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 295; Phys. Lett. **B274** (1992) 34 (hep-th/9108011).

[5] S. F. Hassan and A. Sen, Nucl.Phys. B375 (1992) 103-118 (hep-th/9109038).

[6] J. Maharana and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B390** (1993) 3 (hep-th/9207016).

[7] A. Giveon and M. Rocek, Nucl. Phys. **B380** (1992) 128 (hep-th/9112070).

[8] E. Bergshoeff, C. M. Hull and T. Ortin, Nucl. Phys. **B451** (1995) 547 (hep-th/9504081).

[9] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109 (hep-th/9410167).

[10] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 85 (hep-th/9503124).

[11] L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré and M. Trigiante, Nucl. Phys. **B496** (1997) 617 (hep-th/9611014),
L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré, R. Minasian and M. Trigiante, Nucl. Phys. **B493** (1997) 249 (hep-th/9612202).

[12] D. Brace, B. Morariu, and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. **B549** (1999) 181 (hep-th/9811213).

[13] M. Fukuma, T. Oota and H. Tanaka, *Comments on T-dualities of Ramond-Ramond Potentials* (hep-th/9907132).

[14] A. Konechny and A. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **B453** (1999) 23 (hep-th/9901077).

[15] S. F. Hassan, *T-Duality, Space-time Spinors and R-R Fields in Curved Backgrounds* (hep-th/9907152).

[16] I. Bakas, K. Sfetsos, Phys. Lett. **B349** (1995) 448 (hep-th/9502065).

[17] S. F. Hassan, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 362 (hep-th/9504148).

[18] S. F. Hassan, Nucl. Phys. **B454** (1995) 86 (hep-th/9408060).

[19] C. G. Callan, C. Lovelace, C. R. Nappi and S. A. Yost, Nucl. Phys. **B308** (1988) 221.

[20] J. Polchinski, *TASI Lectures on D-Branes* (hep-th/9611050);
J. Polchinski, S. Chaudhuri, C. V. Johnson, *Notes on D-Branes* (hep-th/9602052).

[21] L. J. Romans, Phys. Lett. **169B** (1986) 374.

[22] J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 269.

[23] J. C. Breckenridge, G. Michaud and R. C. Myers, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 6438 (hep-th/9611174).

[24] A. D. Kennedy, J. Math. Phys. **22** (1981) 1330,
J. W. van Holten and A. Van Proeyen, J. Phys. **A15** (1982) 3763.

[25] A. Van Proeyen, *Tools for Supersymmetry* (hep-th/9910030).

[26] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, M. B. Green, G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B470** (1996) 113 (hep-th/9601150).

[27] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, C. N. Pope and K. S. Stelle, *T-duality in the Green-Schwarz Formalism and the Massless/Massive IIA Duality Map*, (hep-th/9907202).

[28] B. Pioline and A. Schwarz, JHEP 9908 (1999) 021, (hep-th/9908019).

[29] A. Dhar, G. Mandal, S. R. Wadia and K. P. Yogendran, $D1/D5$ *System with B-Field, Noncommutative Geometry and the CFT of the Higgs Branch*, (hep-th/9910194).